

THE HOMONYMY OF *PAPILIO AGLAJA* LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA, PIERIDAE AND NYMPHALIDAE): REQUEST FOR VALIDATION. Z.N.(S.) 1791

A further Note on the Application

(see volume 24, pages 186-189; volume 25, pages 68-71)

By C. F. Cowan

1. In submitting the original application in this case I attempted to set out the facts and arguments concisely. The "Memorandum in Opposition" to it by Messrs C. F. dos Passos, LL.B., D.Sc., F.R.E.S. and B. C. S. Warren, F.R.E.S. (1968), of which they courteously sent me a draft, seemed to me, as I immediately told them in a detailed reply, so wide-sweeping yet so imprecise, that a brief answer is difficult.

2. In their introductory paragraph they say that I requested: "among other things that the International Commission by use of its plenary powers reverse the decisions and usages of various authors since 1942 or even earlier." I did not. I was at pains to explain that the alteration in the International Code in 1961, whereby the "first reviser rule" of Article 24 (a) supplanted the "page precedence rule", had already had this effect, as shown by Higgins in 1967; and that under the current Code the valid names for the two species we are discussing have been, since 1961, *Delias pasithoe* and *Argynnis (Mesoacidalia) aglaja*. My sole object was to ask that the universal usage of all authors for the past 75 years, of using the name *aglaja* for the Pierid, should not be upset by the inescapable *fait accompli* that it now applies rightly to the Nymphalid.

3. Again, in their opening paragraph they say that my "argument is based on the first reviser rule (Article 24)". Of course it is. That is the Code. In all their succeeding paragraphs they totally ignore it and follow the page precedence rule, which is not.

4. In their paragraphs 1 and 3 they repeat "In 1942 Hemming studied this problem . . . Cowan proposes to reverse Hemming's conclusions by resurrecting the Nymphalid name . . . Hemming's views so well expressed in 1942 are just as valid today as when they were written." But since 1942 the Code on which they were based has been changed, and it now completely invalidates them. Hemming himself has in fact accepted this, for in dealing with this very problem he has written (1967 : p. 287): "The situation was however completely changed by the introduction . . . in 1961 of the First Reviser principle for dealing with cases of this kind. In the present case Linnaeus himself was the First Reviser when he rejected and replaced the name *Papilio aglaja* as applied to the Pierid species and retained that name for the Nymphalid. Thus under the current Code the name *Papilio aglaja* Linnaeus, 1758 (: 481) is the correct name for the present Nymphalid species."

5. They become extremely confusing and involved in their paragraphs 3 and 4. Having rightly quoted Article 59: "A species-group name that is a junior primary homonym must be permanently rejected", and having said that the two "*P. aglaja*" of 1758 were primary homonyms, they suddenly treat "the latter" as a "primary junior homonym". They completely ignore Article 24 which directs how the junior of simultaneously published homonyms shall be determined, and instead purport to determine the case for themselves on page precedence. They then contend that Linnaeus' 12th revised edition was not a revision, and that "a primary junior homonym was not an available name". Finally, in their concluding lines they ask the Commission for a Declaration that "nothing in Article 24 of the Code shall authorize or permit a reviser to revive a primary junior [or junior primary?] homonym as a species-group name". This is absurd. Nothing does so nor can. The homonyms dealt with in Article 24 are exclusively the rare simultaneous ones.

6. When the Code was changed in 1961 there was immediately an arguable case for conserving the name *charlotta*, introduced in 1942 for the Nymphalid because *aglaja* was then invalid on page precedence, but now in turn invalidated. The only

possible grounds for such a case would have been the conservation of *charlotta*, in use for some 20 years. None was ever submitted. Now that even Hemming reverts automatically to *aglaia* in his great posthumous work on the Generic Names of the Butterflies of the World, which must stand as a standard reference for many years, surely this result must be accepted.

7. In my original application, at paragraph 7, I said that a number of authors had used *charlotta* for the Nymphalid, and as examples cited three. Dos Passos and Warren, in their paragraph 8, say "but there are two more such works that he does not mention." If there are only two, it is surprising. There are many who still retain *aglaia* for the Nymphalid, and all since 1961 are correct under the current Code.

8. As to interpreting the first reviser rule (on which they cite the unidentified "dos Passos and Klots, 1958" which anyway was prior to the revised Code and must be irrelevant), surely there can be no doubt. The two simultaneous primary homonyms "*Papilio aglaia*" Linnaeus, 1758 referred to an oriental Pierid and an European Nymphalid. The homonymy required, under Article 24 (a), action by a first reviser. "Between 1758 and 1767 a number of books on natural history were published. Among them is Linnaeus' *Fauna Suecica* (1761)", they say in paragraph 5; then they ask the International Commission "Is this a revision?" It was, as its title says, a "*Fauna of Sweden, comprising the Animals of the Swedish Kingdom . . . Edition 2*", a superb revision of his first edition of 1746, but no more. It mentioned the Nymphalid *P. aglaia* which occurs in Sweden, but not the oriental Pierid. It did not notice, much less revise, the homonymy problem. Nor did any other author before 1767. Only one publication mentioned both the species; the 1761 anonymous pirated Halae Magdeburgicae copy of the tenth edition. All it did was add to the synonymy by misspelling both names "*aglaia*".

9. Then appeared the 12th Edition of *Systema Naturae*. Dos Passos and Warren cite its title in full. They consider that a reviser should contain "usually, although not necessarily, such words as revision, review, monograph, or something similar in the title. It deals with a species, genus or family. That is where it usually ends. It does not include the entire animal kingdom. It is a work generally with a detailed discussion of the taxonomic problems involved and contains keys, synonymies, plates, figures, and a bibliography. The [1767] *Systema Naturae* does not contain most of these elements". In fact the title includes "Editio duodecima reformata"—"Twelfth revised edition". In those days the entire animal kingdom could still, just, be contained in one volume, and Linnaeus in his masterly way achieved it, a feat never since possible. It contains keys: those for the Insecta being on p. 356; for the Lepidoptera divided between pp. 744 (giving *Papilio*), 796 (giving *Sphinx*), and 808 (giving *Phalaena*); and that for *Papilio* on p. 744, dividing it into 5 main and sundry minor phalanges which in turn are separately keyed through their *species differentia*. Each species is given a full synonymy and list of references, the latter in particular detailing all previously published illustrations, thus obviating the need for including plates and figures. Bibliographies, quite adequate and intelligible for the period, are given for each Class; that for the Insecta being on p. 535. All the necessary elements required by dos Passos and Warren for a "revision" are present. That Linnaeus regarded it as one is repeatedly shown in his foreword, the "Ratio Editionis", which includes the subtitle "Methodus Animalium ex novis observatis reformata".

10. Linnaeus' great 12th edition of *Systema Naturae* was most certainly a revision of his 10th. It contained indubitably the first revision of his rare little error of homonymy in the earlier work. And with incomparable sagacity he complied not only with Article 24 (a) of the 1961 Code, but also with Recommendation 24 A. In the usage of the 1760s, the oriental Pierid was scarcely known and the European Nymphalid was familiar. So he retained the already well-used *P. aglaia* for the Nymphalid and changed the Pierid to *P. pasithoe*, "selecting the name that will best ensure stability and universality of nomenclature".

11. The valid name for the Nymphalid under the Code since 1961 has been *aglaia* and nothing can alter this, unless it is suppressed by use of the plenary powers. Such action, I think, would now be unwise, particularly since *charlotta* was only valid

during the brief interregnum of the page precedence rule; since only five main works have been found to have adopted it; and since the re-validation of the name *aglaia* has now been widely publicised.

12. For the Pierid, as early as 1893 it was pointed out by Mitis that it should be known as *Delias aglaia* on priority. Overlooking the primary homonymy in *Papilio*, all the many works on oriental Lepidoptera in the past 75 years have followed him. Talbot (1937 : 317-318) gives many useful references for the species; most earlier than 1893 called it *pasithoe* and all since *aglaia*. My present concern is to conserve this well-known name *Delias aglaia*, now invalidated through the change in the Code. It is most misleading to say that stability and universality will be defeated if this is achieved (dos Passos and Warren, paragraph 9).

13. It is also utterly misleading to suggest that chaos will ensue if Linnaeus' 12th edition of *Systema Naturae* is considered a revision. Certainly the other early authors' works were "replete with changes of names, synonyms and homonyms". But such name-changers were making invalid names, not acting as first revisers within the narrow confines of Article 24 (a).

14. In conclusion, I submit that dos Passos' and Warren's requests are each either ill-founded or irrelevant; and my original requests to the International Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 24 (3) : 188-189) stand unaltered.

REFERENCES

To the admirable list compiled by dos Passos and Warren (1968) the following are relevant additions:

- DOS PASSOS, CYRIL FRANKLIN, and WARREN, BRISBANE CHARLES SOMERVILLE. 1968. The Homonymy of *Papilio aglaia* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Pieridae and Nymphalidae); Request for validation. Memorandum in opposition. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 25 (2/3) : 68-71
- HEMMING, ARTHUR FRANCIS. 1967. The Generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-Species. *Bull. Br. Mus. nat. Hist. (Ent.) Suppl.* 9 : 509 pp.
- MITIS, HEINRICH RITTER VON. 1893. Revision des Pieriden-Genus *Delias*. *Dt. ent. Z. Iris* 6 : 97-153, pls. 2, 3 (p. 120 and note refer)
- TALBOT, GEORGE. 1937. *A Monograph of the Pierine Genus Delias* (6) : pp. 261-656, 48 pls. London (in 6 parts, 1928-1937).

AN APPLICATION FOR THE RETENTION OF *PAPILIO AGLAJA* AS THE VALID NAME OF THE NYMPHALID SPECIES

By N. D. Riley and L. G. Higgins

Until C. F. Cowan's application under the above main title was published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature (24 : 186) we had hoped that the conclusions reached by Francis Hemming in respect of this issue and published posthumously in his *Generic Names of the Butterflies* (1967 : 287) would have been accepted as valid, and that the question as to whether or not the name *aglaia* was the valid name for the Nymphalid butterfly known in Britain as the Dark Green Fritillary would no longer have been in dispute. The present application is submitted in the hope that it will enable the International Commission to reach a final decision on this issue.

2. The passage referred to above, in Hemming's work, occurs under the entry *Mesoacidalia* and runs as follows:—"The situation was completely changed by the introduction into the current revised Code of 1961 of the First Reviser principle for dealing with cases of this kind (Article 24 (a)). In the present case Linnaeus himself was the first reviser when . . . he rejected and replaced the name *Papilio aglaia* as applied to the Pierid species and retained that name for the present Nymphalid species.